

**MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
JULY 24, 2013
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Answering the roll call were: Potts, Platteter, Forrest, Carpenter, Carr, Staunton

Absent from the roll: Scherer, Grabiell, Schroeder, Kilberg, Cherkassky

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Commissioner Carpenter moved approval of the meeting agenda. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

IV. COMMUNITY COMMENT

Gene Persha, 6917 Cornelia Drive addressed the Commission and informed them in his opinion houses undergoing extensive remodels should also have an overseer. Persha said large remodeling projects also have dumpsters in the front yard, porta-pots, parking issues, and construction noise similar to new construction.

Persha suggested that the City establish tear down and remodel rosters that include photos of the property before construction. Continuing, Persha further stated he has another issue with redevelopment and it's with landscaping, adding in his opinion someone needs to oversee these remodeling projects to ensure that the yard is seeded/sodded in a timely manner and back to its original shape within a certain period of time; not years.

Persha referred to Ordinance 480.02 which talks about time limits for construction, adding that the 12 month period for exterior finishes should be what the project is held to, and if more time is needed the applicant must reapply for another permit. Concluding, Persha also recommended review of the commercial projects.

Chair Staunton thanked Mr. Persha for his comments and asked City Staff to consider his issues.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Subdivision. Preliminary Plat. Shanight Addition. 5612 Tracy Avenue, Edina, MN

Planner Presentation

Planner Aaker reported Rodney Helm on behalf of Tom and Gretchen Shanight is proposing to subdivide the property at 5612 Tracy Avenue into two lots. The existing home would be torn down, and two new homes built on the new lots. To accommodate the request the following is required: A subdivision; and Lot width variances from 80.7 feet to 80 feet for each lot; lot depth variances from 157 feet to 122 feet; and lot area variances from 17,651 square feet to 9,820 square feet.

Planner Aaker stated both lots would gain access off Tracy Avenue by a shared driveway, utilizing the existing driveway to the site. Within this neighborhood, the median lot area is 17,651 square feet, median lot depth is 157 feet, and the median lot width is 80.7. This is a neighborhood with varying lot sizes. Larger lots to the north across Vernon and to the east across Tracy Avenue have established the large minimum lot sizes for this property. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property in the same manner as the existing lots on the west side of Tracy Avenue .

Aaker reported that a subdivision with similar circumstances was recently approved in this area at 5633 Tracy Avenue by the applicant.

Aaker concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the proposed two lot subdivision of 5612 Tracy Avenue; lot width variances from 80.7 feet to 80 feet for each lot; lot depth variances from 157 feet to 122 feet for each lot; and lot area variances from 17,651 square feet to 9,820 square feet based on the following findings:

1. Except for the variances, the proposal meets the required standards and ordinance for a subdivision.
2. The proposal is consistent with the lots on this block on the west side of Tracy Avenue north of Hawkes Drive.
3. The 80-foot wide lot is wider than the general standard required width of 75 feet.
4. The 9,820 square foot lots are larger than the general standard minimum lot area of 9,000 square feet.
5. The proposal meets the required standards for a variance, because:
 - a. There is a unique hardship to the property caused by the existing size of the property which is roughly two times the size of every lot on the block.
 - b. The requested variances are reasonable in the context of the immediate neighborhood. The existing lot is both larger and wider than most properties in the area, including every lot on the blocks north of Hawkes Drive and west of Tracy Avenue.
 - c. The proposed subdivision would result in two lots more characteristic of the neighborhood.

- d. The variances would meet the intent of the ordinance because the proposed lots are of similar size to others in the neighborhood.
- e. If the variances were denied, the applicant would be denied a use of his property, an 80-foot wide, 9,000+ square foot lot, which is common to the area.

Approval is also subject to the following conditions:

1. The City must approve the final plat within one year of preliminary approval or receive a written application for a time extension or the preliminary approval will be void.
2. Park dedication fee of \$5,000 must be paid prior to release of the final plat.
3. Vehicle access to these lots shall be off of Tracy Avenue.
4. Compliance with the conditions required by the director of engineering in his memo dated July 18, 2013. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the following items must be submitted:
 - a. Submit evidence of a Nine Mile Creek Watershed District approval. The City may require revisions to the preliminary plat to meet the district's requirements.
 - b. A curb-cut permit must be obtained from the Edina engineering department.
 - c. A grading plan subject to review and approval of the city engineer.
 - d. A construction management plan will be required for the construction of the new homes.
 - e. Utility hook-ups are subject to review of the city engineer.
 - f. A private driveway easement established over Lot 1 to serve Lot 2 must be filed with Hennepin County.

Appearing for the Applicant

Rodney Helm

Discussion

Commissioner Forrest asked procedurally if the City Council hears this request twice. Planner Aaker responded in the affirmative. Council hears the request for preliminary and final.

Commissioner Carr questioned if the project were approved would the applicant be able to build houses on the lots without variances. Planner Aaker said the applicant indicated houses could be built without variances from the zoning ordinance.

Chair Staunton asked Planner Aaker if the statistics were driven by the 500-foot neighborhood, adding it seems like a large lot area variance is needed. Aaker agreed the lot area variance appears large; adding variances from the subdivision ordinance would be required. Commissioner Platteter asked for clarification on if the new houses would meet the zoning ordinance. Aaker reiterated the applicant did not indicate further variances would be needed.

Applicant Presentation

Rodney Helm addressed the Commission informing them he is representing the Shanight's, property owners. Helm reported he was the agent that presented the Kiser Addition subdivision at 5633 Tracy, adding he is familiar with this neighborhood. Helm said if one looks at the 500-foot neighborhood it appears to be two separate neighborhoods-west of Tracy and east of Tracy. Helm explained the reasons for the variances to the subdivision ordinance result from the fact when calculating the 500-foot neighborhood both "neighborhoods" were included. Continuing, Helm said in his opinion this division would help create a strong corner for Hawkes Terrace. He said the existing home is an outdated four level home without much architectural value. Helm further stated that he believes retaining the driveway access off Tracy Avenue for both properties makes the most sense with less disruption to the site and neighbors. He also added close attention was and will be paid to the existing conditions on the site, including the grade and vegetation and of course vehicle access.

Concluding, Helm acknowledged that the subdivision misses all three median requirements; width, area and depth; however, he believes the attention paid to the redevelopment of this site (topography, vegetation) will be a benefit to the neighborhood and Edina.

Commissioner Carpenter asked Mr. Helm where the driveway access is for the homes directly across the street. Helm responded that he believes both properties access Hawkes. Helm said the proposed access off Tracy for the new lots really help "set up" the site for a good redevelopment.

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

Public Hearings

Tim Laughlin, 5705 Hawkes Terrace informed the Commission he lives directly across the street from the subject site. Laughlin stated he has lived in this neighborhood for many years, adding this corner worked for him all these years; however he can be agreeable to the proposed subdivision as submitted especially since the lots would be accessed off Tracy Avenue, not Hawkes Terrace.

Terry Rocheford, 5604 Hawkes Terrace, told the Commission she doesn't have an issue with the subdivision; however wants assurances the access will be off Tracy Avenue. Rocheford said she has additional concerns about parking on the street and clear view when leaving Hawkes Terrace onto Tracy. Concluding, Rocheford asked the applicant to police the site and keep the tall grass mowed.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak to the issue; being none Commissioner Carpenter moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; public hearing closed.

Discussion

Commissioner Potts stated in his opinion this is a reasonable request adding he appreciates that the applicant paid close attention to the topography and vegetation when designing the plat.

Commissioner Carpenter stated he too feels the proposed subdivision is sensitive to the environment; however, he is somewhat concerned with the sight lines at the corner as expressed by Ms. Rocheford. Carpenter stated he wants assurances that house placement and topography are carefully assessed to ensure clear view is maintained.

Commissioner Platteter commented that he likes how the developer is working with the land, adding in his opinion the shared driveway is a great option. If done as depicted it should create a good plat.

Commissioner Carr stated she has no additional comments.

Commissioner Forrest commented that it may be possible this site is one lot because of the terrain. She also expressed concern that any redevelopment of this lot would impact the urban canopy. Forrest encouraged the builder to be in contact with the neighbors during the construction process.

Chair Staunton said he had an initial concern with the request because of the magnitude of the lot area variance; however, understands differing neighborhoods can play a role in “skewing” the numbers. Staunton stated he also has a strong preference for the driveway access to remain off Tracy Avenue as indicated on the plans. He further suggested the possibility of limiting parking to one side of the street to ensure greater visibility.

Motion

Commissioner Potts moved to recommend preliminary plat approval with variances based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried. 7-0.

B. Final Rezoning, Final Plat and Final Development. Edina Fifty Five, LLC. 5109-5125 49th Street West.

Planner Presentation

Planner Aaker informed the Commission Hunt Associates are requesting final review of the redevelopment of three lots located at 5109-5125 West 49th Street. The applicant is proposing to tear down the existing two apartments and single family home on the site) and build a new 16-unit attached housing development. The subject properties total 1.43 acres in size; therefore, the proposed density of the project would be 11 units per acre. Continuing, Aaker noted the applicant received preliminary rezoning and plan approval of this project on April 16, 2013.

Aaker reported in order to obtain to approvals for the project, the following is the final step required for approval; Final Development Plan and Final Rezoning to PUD and Zoning Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD.

The proposed plans are consistent with the plans that were recommended for approval by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council; including reducing the density by eliminating one unit and reducing the height from four stories to three.

Planner Aaker concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the Final Rezoning from PRD-2, Planned Residential District to PUD, Planned Unit Development District, Final Development and Final Plat to plat and build 16 new townhomes on the subject 1.43 acre parcel subject to the following findings:

1. The proposal is consistent with the approved Preliminary Development Plan for the site.
2. The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which contemplates medium density housing for the site.
3. The proposed plat meets all Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance requirements.
4. The proposal would create a more efficient and creative use of the property. Currently the site does not engage Vernon Avenue. Today it is clearly the back of the site, and contains mature trees. The proposed site plan turns and faces Vernon Avenue with a row of two-story townhomes.
5. Parking areas and garages are internal to the site, and not visible from 49th street or Vernon Avenue.
6. The project would enhance pedestrian connections. The plan provides for a public sidewalk through the site from 49th to Vernon, that would connect, not only this development, but the entire area to the north to the Grandview District.
7. Landscaping would be enhanced. Extensive Landscaping is proposed around the perimeter of the site and adjacent to the proposed townhomes. The number of over story trees is over double the number required by City Code. The mature trees along Vernon Avenue would be preserved.

Approval is also subject to the following Conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
 - Site plan date stamped June 24, 2013.
 - Grading plan date stamped June 24, 2013.
 - Utility plan date stamped June 24, 2013.
 - Landscaping plan date stamped June 24, 2013.
 - Building elevations date stamped June 24, 2013.
 - Building materials board as presented at the Planning Commission and City Council meeting.
2. Prior the issuance of a building permit, a final landscape plan must be submitted, subject to staff approval. Additionally, a performance bond, letter-of-credit, or cash deposit must be submitted for one and one-half times the cost amount for completing the required landscaping, screening, or erosion control measures.

3. The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.
4. Submit a copy of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District permit. The City may require revisions to the approved plans to meet the district's requirements.
5. The Final Plat must be filed at the County within one-year after City Council approval. If the plat is not filed it shall be deemed null and void.
6. A shared parking and access agreement must be established across the Plat.
7. A park dedication fee of \$5,000 per dwelling unit is required. The park dedication fees are due prior to release of the final plat.
8. Compliance with the conditions required by the city engineer in his memo dated July 19, 2013.
9. Compliance with the fire marshal recommendation in his email dated July 12, 2013.

Appearing for the Applicant

Chris Palkowitsch, BKV Group and D. Hunt, Hunt Associates

Discussion

Commissioner Carr stated she was very happy to see that the unit count and building height was reduced. Carr asked which unit was removed. Mr. Palkowitsch responded that the NE unit was eliminated.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Palkowitsch addressed the Commission and explained they listened to both the Planning Commission and City Council suggestions before submitting their final plans. As previously mentioned a unit was eliminated, building height was reduced, and the units along Vernon Avenue were pulled back. Also eliminated as per Commission and Council requests were the roof top deck options. The units along Vernon Avenue includes a buffer but continue to have presence on Vernon Avenue. Palkowitsch said one of the key elements of the improvements to the site is how the site is connected to greater Edina for both pedestrians and bikes. The proposed connection to Vernon increases access for the entire neighborhood. A sign is also proposed identifying the development.

Continuing, Palkowitsch said sustainability goals include retaining as much of the mature vegetation and trees as possible, including a good vegetative buffer from the surrounding traffic for those homes on Vernon Avenue. Palkowitsch said building materials have been changed from wood to stone and fiber cement with stucco to match the stone.

Concluding, Palkowitsch said they accept the recommendations from the City Engineer; however are opposed to the request for a 5-foot grass area between the roadway and sidewalk on Vernon Avenue.

Discussion

Commissioner Forrest commented that she appreciates the attention paid to the existing vegetation;

however, wishes there was a tree survey that better identifies what's there and what will be added.

Commissioner Potts stated that he isn't sure how he feels about the proposed monument sign in a residential neighborhood. Mr. Palkowitsch reported ordinance allows 24 square foot identification sign.

Commissioner Platteter said his concern is how the neighborhood would be impacted during the construction process. He added he wants the project to be policed per the new ordinance 411. Planner Aaker responded 411 pertain to single and double dwelling units. Platteter acknowledged that fact; however pointed out the residential homes across the street would be greatly impacted as a result of this redevelopment.

Commissioner Carr commented that she tends to agree with Engineer Houle's recommendation of a boulevard style sidewalk for the units facing Vernon Avenue. Commissioner Forrest agreed, adding the intent is to develop sidewalks away from the roads; it's safer. Commissioner Platteter stated he too agrees with Houle on providing some boulevard area; however, without a plan to view it's difficult to comment on. Platteter said he's not sure there is adequate spacing to accommodate that boulevard while retaining yard space for the units.

A discussion ensued on the recommendation from Engineer Houle regarding providing a boulevard along Vernon Avenue. Commissioners expressed the opinion that they agreed with Houle's comments initially; however, because of the future possibility of realigning the exit ramp and to continue to provide adequate spacing for the Vernon Avenue units it's difficult to make an educated guess on if this boulevard request would work as requested by Houle; or if it needs some form of tweaking to ensure the units on Vernon Avenue remain viable.

Mr. Hunt expressed the opinion that moving the units back from Vernon Avenue would be difficult because the site was designed with what exists, pointing out the real possibility that in the future the exit ramp could be reconfigured. Commissioner Platteter agreed they don't have adequate information on potential roadway changes and requirements.

Commissioner Carr asked Planner Aaker if the City requires the requested boulevard area. Planner Aaker said at this time it isn't a requirement; however the City is going in that direction as mentioned by Commissioner Forrest.

Chair Staunton noted the change per Fire Marshall on the drive aisle width from 18-feet to 20-feet and questioned if that would be a problem. Mr. Palkowitsch responded at this time they are working with the Fire Marshall on that requirement.

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Mary Hartupée, 5016 Edenbrook Lane, pointed out Vernon Avenue is a very busy street and trying to maintain green boulevard space would be difficult. She pointed out the requested 5-foot boulevard would also be difficult to maintain because of the high volume of traffic and materials used by the street crew during winter weather. Hartupée thanked the developers for fine tuning this project; adding it's a better project than before. Hartupée also suggested erecting a stop sign for those exiting

the development.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak to the project; being none Commissioner Carpenter moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Platteter seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Continued Discussion

Commissioner Forrest said the goal of the PUD process is to find solutions for both sides; adding she believes this project is superior to what was originally presented. Forrest said she is also in favor of Engineer Houle's requirements including the boulevard along Vernon Avenue; but isn't sure in what form that boulevard should be. Forrest acknowledged the juggling act between privacy vs. engagement for the Vernon Avenue units.

Chair Staunton said he understands the request for the buffer along Vernon Avenue; acknowledging it does create a change in plans for the Vernon Avenue units; noting, the idea of the buffer is to provide more safety for pedestrians. Continuing, Staunton reiterated the requested change to boulevard along Vernon may be an issue that needs further review. He suggested a 6-foot sidewalk closer to the street be looked at; however, on this point he isn't sure. Staunton said he agrees with Houle on storm water retention and the Fire Marshall on drive aisle width. Staunton commented he was unsure about a stop sign exiting the site.

Mr. Hunt said if the Commission really objects to the monument sign it will not be built. Hunt said the proposed sign not only identifies the development but helped screen the mechanical box equipment. Commissioner Forrest said this development would be a very nice welcome to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Potts said in his opinion this project is positive for the neighborhood. The additions of a simple sidewalk and bike walkway is a great amenity to access Vernon Avenue.

Motion

Commissioner Platteter moved to recommend Final Development and Final Rezoning to PUD and a zoning ordinance amendment establishing the PUD subject to staff conditions (all staff) and the additional condition that this project be reviewed under Ordinance 411; the Residential Construction Maintenance Plan; citing the residential nature directly across the road. Commissioner Forrest seconded the motion.

A brief discussion ensued on the sidewalk/boulevard area on Vernon Avenue. It was recommended that the applicants address the request from the City Engineer and negotiate with Council if this request won't work. It was further suggested that if revised they buffer as much as possible using the existing grade to provide the Vernon Avenue units with enough yard/patio space. Commissioners observed without graphics it was difficult to envision the area with the recommended boulevard.

The discussion also acknowledged that in the future the public right of way will change along with the potential for realignment of the exit ramp. It was further noted that the traffic exiting Highway 100 onto Vernon will continue to require access to Interlachen Boulevard

Chair Staunton said his suggestion of a 6-foot wide sidewalk (near street) with 4 + feet of boulevard was

a compromise that may work; however as previously mentioned without seeing it it is difficult to design or envision. It was further suggested that staff conditions (all) be available for review at the Council level.

Concluding, Commissioners thanked the developers for their response to their earlier comments adding in their opinion this will be a good project and possibly the first in the redevelopment of the Grandview area.

Ayes; Carpenter, Potts, Platteter, Carr, Forrest, Staunton. Motion carried.

VI. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Sketch Plan Review – Frauenshuh Commercial Real Estate Group – 5801 Edina Industrial Boulevard, Edina, MN

Staff Presentation

Planner Aaker informed the Commission they are being asked to consider a sketch plan proposal to re-develop 5801 Edina Industrial Boulevard from office uses to retail uses including a drive-through. Currently the building on the site contains a real estate office, a hair loss treatment center, a telecommunication switching site and a small vacancy formerly occupied by a builder office/showroom. The applicant, Frauenshuh Commercial Real Estate Group, would like to repurpose and remodel the existing building with neighborhood retail services.

Aaker explained to accommodate the request, the following would be required:

1. A Rezoning from POD, Planned Office District-1, to PCD-2, Planned Commercial District-2.
2. A Comprehensive Guide Plan Amendment from Office to Neighborhood Commercial.

Continuing, Aaker reported that the property is located just west of Highway 100 and is located across the street from retail uses that are zoned PCD-2, Planned Commercial District. Uses include a gas station, Burger King, and a small retail strip center. North and east of the site are office/light industrial uses. The proposed use of the property would be consistent with the existing land uses to the south. Aaker noted this property is located within an area of the City that is designated as a “Potential Area of Change” within the 2008 Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan states that within the Potential Areas of Change, “A development proposal that involves a Comprehensive Plan Amendment or a rezoning will require a Small Area Plan study prior to planning application. However, the authority to initiate a Small Area Plan rests with the City

Council.” Therefore, the decision to require a Small Area Plan can be made by the City Council at the Sketch Plan review.

Appearing for the Applicant

David Anderson, Frauenshuh and Nick Sperides, SRa

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Anderson addressed the Commission and reported their intent is to rezone the property from POD1, (Planned Office District) to PCD2, (Planned Commercial District). Anderson explained this is a sizeable employment area, adding their goal is to repurpose the property to better serve neighborhood commercial service demands and the economic viability of the property.

With graphics Anderson pointed out “before” and “after” schematics of the property noting the building is low level. If the Commission and Council are agreeable to repurposing the property the following changes to the property would include:

- Implement an updated landscape plan
- Improve and repair the building’s exterior, to include lighting, awnings and other architectural features
- Create a better pedestrian experience by including walkways and outdoor seating areas
- Potential for a drive-through option
- Reconfigure the parking in keeping with ordinance requirements and
- Improved internal vehicle access and circulation.

Concluding Anderson asked the Commission for their opinion on the sketch plan.

Discussion

Commissioner Platteter commented that he likes the concept; however, believes this is a hard site to get in and out of. Platteter suggested reconsidering access points (eliminate west entry along Edina Ind. Blvd.) and changing the location of the proposed drive-through; possibly to the rear. Continuing, Platteter also suggested energizing the corner of Metro Blvd/Edina Inc. Blvd. to be more pedestrian friendly. Concluding, Platteter stated he understands the requested change, adding it would continue the synergy of the areas service component; however, this is a hard site.

Mr. Sperides responded that they looked at different scenarios for the drive-through but found out that moving it to the rear wouldn’t work because of the three lanes (in, out & Drive-through), circulation and the difficulty in ensuring that the driver is on the proper side. Commissioner Platteter agreed driver placement was an issue, he noted in the Grandview area a drive-through is located between buildings; in the middle. Mr. Sperides added they are open to revisiting drive-through placement, adding they don’t know if a drive-through would be part of the equation; however, want that option kept open because it’s important to retail. Continuing, Sperides said another point they needed to keep in mind was stacking. Platteter agreed, adding as presented he is unsure if stacking would be adequate. Mr.

Sperides pointed out adequate stacking capacity is also very important for the retailer; without adequate stacking the business would suffer too.

Chair Staunton commented that it is important to both the Commission and City Council that adequate stacking space is provided for drive-through window components. Staunton asked the applicant what their vision is for this property.

Mr. Anderson said Frauenshuh observed this area was undergoing a change and creating an opportunity to repurpose the property in response to that change would benefit everyone. Anderson said what they do know is that the employment base is there and retail services to respond to that base are needed. Continuing, Anderson said the vision is to capture the current activity in a positive manner. Anderson added in his opinion this area has become more of a mixed use area, reiterating the introduction of more retail is good.

Commissioner Potts stated in his opinion this area is very challenging and if redeveloped a complete traffic analysis needs to be completed. Planner Aaker responded if a formal application to rezone the property is submitted a traffic analysis is a requirement of that process.

Commissioner Carr said she realizes this is only in the “sketch plan” phase; however if redeveloped she would like the applicant to pay attention to aesthetics; such as lighting, landscaping, outdoor seating areas, etc. to create a more attractive place to visit and view. Anderson commented the intent would be to revitalize the site.

Commissioner Forrest commented that she’s not sure she’s on board with the rezoning request. Forrest said she is concerned with parking, vehicle circulation and the potential drive-through space. Continuing, Forrest pointed out as previously mentioned by Commissioner Potts that much depends on the outcome of the traffic analysis.

Mr. Anderson said the initial thought was to gain Commission and Council input on the proposed rezoning. Anderson said if that support was present it would allow them to prepare a site plan supported by a completed market and traffic analysis for formal review. Anderson explained that is the reason why the plans presented aren’t firm, reiterating they felt the first step was to gain input on the rezoning.

A discussion ensued on if the Commission felt extending the PCD zoning designation to this side of the street makes sense. Commissioners expressed the opinion that pedestrian and vehicle safety is of the utmost importance, pointing out the volume of activity in this “neighborhood” is very high. Commissioners also observed that it is difficult to make a decision without the facts; such as tenant mix and how that mix relates to traffic.

Commissioner Forrest asked Planner Aaker if the site were rezoned would all uses within the PCD-2 zoning district be allowed. Aaker responded in the affirmative; adding parking requirements need to be met for each use which could limit uses.

The discussion continued on the rezoning clarifying without the traffic analysis and knowledge of the uses in the tenant space it is difficult to make an educated decision. Commissioners suggested moving forward keeping in mind how important the relationship is between traffic and use. It was further noted that if it is found that pedestrians do want to cross the street both ways having these amenities makes sense and would be of benefit to the area and areas users.

Mr. Anderson thanked the Commission for their comments, adding they would speak with City staff before submitting the sketch plan to the City Council.

B. Residential Redevelopment Ordinance – Recap from City Council Meeting

Chair Staunton reminded the Commission of the numerous meetings held on residential redevelopment and amending the Zoning Ordinance. Staunton said the Commission forwarded their final draft to the City Council for their July 16th meeting. Staunton stated he along with Commissioners Forrest and Potts attended that meeting to present the Commission's recommendations. Staunton stated after Council action there was concern that the Council didn't understand the intent of the Commission on specific issues; mainly building height, 2nd story step elimination and setbacks.

Chair Staunton said in speaking with City Staff he felt there was a need to reiterate to the Council the Commission's intent on one set of items (#3 per memo) and referred the Commission to the attached statement of intent and graphics.

Clarifying Staunton said at their July 16th meeting the Council adopted a 30-foot cap on building height and elimination of the second floor setback; however declined to adopt the side yard setback formula. Staunton added he doesn't want to second guess the Council and is agreeable with their decision; however, reiterated he wants to make sure they understood the Commission's intent on side yard setback as part of a "bundle" that works simultaneously. Staunton referred to the table provided in the Ordinance amendment on side yard setbacks and wondered if the Council thought this table was too cumbersome. Staunton said the goal of the Commission was also to provide the public with greater clarity in the Ordinance; however, the Council may not have felt this was achieved in the Commission's final draft.

Staunton told the Commission he would be forwarding his statement along with the graphics provided by Commissioner Potts to the Council before their final reading on the Ordinance amendments at their August 5th meeting. Staunton asked the Commission for their input on the "statement". He acknowledged the statement also recommends that on lots narrower than 75-feet in width that there be at least a total of 25% of the lot width (with a minimum setback no less than what currently exists).

This formula may bring greater simplicity and clarity than the sliding scale originally proposed or the setback chart provided by the Commission.

Concluding, Staunton reiterated that he wants the Council to know that the opinion of the Commission was that this was a three part “bundle”; building height, eliminate 2nd floor setbacks and side yard setback. Staunton noted that the Commission wasn’t wedded to any particular mechanics for accomplishing this; however, creating additional space between structures on small lots was their goal. Staunton said he was sorry he wasn’t clear enough with the Council and asked the Commission their opinion on his statement.

Commissioner Carpenter said in his opinion it is a good statement and fine as written pointing out the statement doesn’t instruct the Council.

A discussion ensued on the statement and graphics prepared by Chair Staunton and Commissioner Potts, noting the intent of the Commission was to provide greater setbacks on smaller lots, adding the statement (or another form) with attachments should be forwarded to the Council. Commissioner Carr said she was concerned the addition of the 25% total lot width formula may also be confusing; however, reiterated the intent was to provide adequate spacing on smaller lots. Carr reiterated that it was at the suggestion of the Commission that staff provide the table found in the draft Ordinance presented to Council on the 16th.

Commissioner Potts said the intent of the Commission was to reduce building height, increase side yard setbacks on smaller lots and eliminate the 2nd story setback formula. Potts said the referenced 25% of lot width included in the statement was intended to be a clearer way to increase setback on lots less than 75-feet in width. Potts acknowledged the table prepared by staff was at the request of the Commission.

Commissioner Forrest stated she continues to be concerned that the Ordinance amendments may not have went “far enough”. Forrest pointed out in the one story and one and one half story neighborhoods a large two story house can still be constructed changing the character of that neighborhood. Forrest said the 25% lot width is another tool to provide greater setbacks, adding the Ordinance can be revisited if it is found the amendments aren’t providing the relief intended.

Commissioner Carr said the intent in her opinion was an Ordinance easier to understand and implement while providing adequate spacing.

Chair Staunton asked the Commission to vote on forwarding the statement with graphics to the City Council for their August 5th meeting. Staunton said he would leave it up to City Staff on now to convey this message.

Motion

Commissioner Platteter moved to forward the statement and graphics provided by Chair Staunton and Commissioner Potts to the August 5, 2013, meeting of the City Council. Commissioner Forrest seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

C. Living Streets Working Group – Appoint Planning Commission reps to working group

Chair Staunton stated that Commissioners Carr and Platteter have expressed interest in serving on the Living Streets working group and asked for a motion to formally nominate them to those positions.

Motion

Commissioner Potts moved to appoint Commissioner Carr and Commissioner Platteter to serve as representatives of the Planning Commission on the Living Streets working group. Commissioner Carpenter seconded the motion. All voted aye; Carr and Platteter appointed as members of the Living Streets working group.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Chair Staunton acknowledged back of packet materials.

VIII. CHAIR AND COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Staunton said he attended his first Grandview Committee meeting, adding he and Michael Schroeder are serving on the Committee and will periodically report back to the Commission. Staunton reported that Mike Fischer and Jennifer Janovy chair the group.

Commissioner Carr commented that she thinks it may be a good idea for staff to apprise the Commission about remodels; along with tear down rebuilds. Staunton agreed adding he would check with staff to see when Cindy Larson the new Redevelopment Coordinator has time to report to us on what she found “out on the streets”. Learning about enforcement would be good for the Commission.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Carr moved meeting adjournment at 10:05 PM. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Jackie Hoogenakker

Respectfully submitted